



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—A COLLATION OF THE OLD ARMENIAN VERSION OF PLATO'S LAWS, BOOK IV.¹

In the remaining books (IV–XII) of the Laws it will not be necessary to point out in detail the many points of identity between the text of the great Paris MS and that of the Armenian translator. In our examination of books I–III we have shown that the Armenian adheres to the text of the Paris Codex 1807 in almost all cases where other MSS, really apographs of it, show deviations. When the Armenian really departs from the Paris text, it is often but to agree with other genuinely independent and old sources, such as Ficino's Latin rendering or the citations of Eusebius and Stobaeus.

In book IV of the Laws the following passages may be noticed. Where the Armenian seems to yield a sound reading I have prefixed an asterisk. The collation is with the text of Schanz all through.

St. 704 B, Sch. 98. 8 πόλις, ἧς περί τὰ νυνδὴ λεχθέντα ἡμῖν. The Arm. implies τὰ νῦν διαλεχθέντα. Cp. Theat. 158 C ἃ τε γὰρ νυνὶ διειλέγμεθα. But the received text is satisfactory, and all that can be here said of the Armenian reading is that it is equally satisfactory.

*St. 704 B, Sch. 98. 10. Schanz reads: τί δέ; λιμένες ἄρ' εἰσὶν κατὰ ταῦτα αὐτῆς, ἢ τὸ παράπαν ἀλίμενος; This is the reading of the Paris MS. Eusebius, in citing the passage, has εἰσὶν κατ' αὐτῆς, ἢ κ. τ. λ., which is also implied by the Arm. Ficino renders: "Portus uero suntne prope? An mare illud penitus importuosum"; which agrees better with the reading of Eusebius than with that of the Paris MS.

*St. 704 B, Sch. 98. 12. Sch. reads with the Paris MS: Ἐλλίμενος μὲν οὖν ταύτῃ γε ὥς δυνατόν, and does not notice the variant οὖν αὐτῇ given in Eusebius and, furthermore, implied by the Armenian. The agreement throughout this passage of the Armenian with Eusebius' citation is important, for it proves (1) that these variants are not due to citation, but were in the text itself which Eusebius had, and (2) that a genuinely old text underlies the Armenian.

¹ See A. J. P. XII 193–210.

St. 704 C, Sch. 98. 15, 16. Perhaps the translator read ἐπιδείσει for ἐπιδείης in both sentences.

*St. 704 C, Sch. 98. 21. The Version adds πάσης, so as to read : τί δέ; πεδίων τε καὶ ὀρών καὶ ὕλης πάσης πῶς μέρος ἐκάστων ἡμῖν εἴληχεν; The sense would be "wood of all sorts." As introductory to the exception he means to make of ship-building wood, Plato may well have written πάσης here; and the fact of πῶς following after it may explain its absence from the Paris MS.

St. 704 D, Sch. 98. 25 πάνν μὲν οὖν]. The Version adds ἐκάτερα, which seems the addition of one who missed the sense of the passage.

*St. 704 D, Sch. 98. 29 μεγάλου τινὸς ἔδει σωτήρός τε αὐτῇ. The Arm. has αὐτῇ, which Ficino also implies: "maximo sibi salutis fundatore opus esset."

St. 704 D, Sch. 99. 3. The Arm. translator renders as if σχεδὸν came after δέοντος. Perhaps, however, he merely read the comma after, instead of before, σχεδόν.

*St. 705 A, Sch. 99. 4, 5 πρόσκοικος γὰρ θάλαττα χώρα τὸ μὲν παρ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἡδύ. This is the reading of the Paris MS. Stobaeus, in citing the passage, reads θαλάττη χώρα, which is also involved by the Armenian. Schanz omits to notice this variant, which has at least as much authority as that of the Paris MS.

*St. 705 A, Sch. 99. 7 ἐμπιπλᾶσα αὐτήν. The Version has αὐτήν, which is also read in early editions of Stobaeus, and must be accepted, if just before θαλάττη χώρα be read.

*St. 705 B, Sch. 99. 12 τραχεῖα δὲ οὖσα δῆλον ὡς οὐκ ἂν πολύφορος ἄμα. Schanz notes that πάμφορος is read in the Paris MS, but that the letters άμ are written over an erasure of πολύφορος, while a manus recentior adds before πάμφορος and outside the line the words πολύφορος τε εἶη καὶ. Eusebius has πολύφορός τ' εἶη καὶ πάμφορος, which Stobaeus also gives, only reading τις for τ'. The Armenian, like Eusebius, adds καὶ παμφ., but omits εἶη and favors γε instead of τ'. Ficino also had the reading of Eusebius, and well brings out its meaning: "Cumque silvosa sit et aspera, licet omnia ferat, non tamen abunde omnia." The reading of Schanz comes to the same thing, but the weight of the evidence is in favor of adding the words καὶ πάμφορος.

St. 705 B, Sch. 99. 19 συγχωροῦμεν τότε λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὀρθῶς καὶ τὰ νῦν. The Arm. involves ὑμᾶς, which Ficino perhaps read, for he renders: "et illa tunc, et nunc ista recte dicta concedimus."

*St. 705 D, Sch. 100. 5. Schanz reads: τὸ δὲ ὅτι πρὸς μέρος ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς πᾶσαν σχεδόν, οὐ πάνν ξυνεχάρουν. The Arm. places the

comma before, not after, *σχεδόν*, with a gain to the sense. Ficino renders: "quoniam vero non ad universam, sed ad virtutis partem ferme equidem non valde laudabam," which perhaps points to similar punctuation in his Greek. Stephanus takes it in the same way.

*St. 706 A, Sch. 100. 8-11. Schanz reads: *τούτον γὰρ δὴ τίθεσθαι τὸν νόμον ὁρθῶς ὑποτίθεμαι μόνον, ὃς ἂν δίκην τοξότου ἐκάστοτε στοχάζηται τούτου ὅτῳ ἂν συνεχῶς τῶν ἀεὶ καλῶν τι ξυνέπηται μόνον, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ξύμπαντα παραλείπη.* In this passage the Paris MS reads *τοῦ τῶν* after *συνεχῶς* and *μόνοι* (sic), *μόνον* being written in margin in late hand. The Armenian confirms Schanz in omitting *τοῦ* after *συνεχῶς*, and also omits *μόνον*, which Ficino also omits: "qui veluti sagittarius illuc animum semper intendit, unde continuo aliquid semperque sequatur eorum quae bona sunt."

St. 706 A, Sch. 100. 12 *ἐάν τε ἄρα τι τῶν ἄλλων*. Here the Version has *ἄλλο* instead of *ἄρα*.

St. 706 C, Sch. 100. 25. The Version unaccountably omits *μονίμων* after *ὀπλιτῶν* in l. 25, and *μένοντας* just below after *ἀποθνήσκειν*. The double omission has a purposive air. But *μονίμων* has not only the authority of the Paris Codex and of Ficino, but of Plutarch as well (vit. Philopoem., p. 363 F). It is to be remarked that Stephanus read *νομίμων* from some bad MS.

St. 707 A, Sch. 101. 19. Schanz reads: *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις αἱ διὰ τὰ ναυτικά πόλεων δυνάμεις ἅμα σωτηρίας τιμὰς οὐ τῷ καλλίστῳ τῶν πολεμικῶν ἀποδιδόασιν. διὰ κυβερνητικῆς γὰρ καὶ πεντηκονταρχίας καὶ ἐρετικῆς [καὶ] παντοδαπῶν καὶ οὐ πάνυ σπουδαίων ἀνθρώπων γιγνομένης, τὰς τιμὰς ἐκάστοις οὐκ ἂν δύναίτο ὁρθῶς ἀποδιδόναι τις.*

In the above the Paris Codex has *ἐρετικῆς* and *ἅμα σωτηρία*. Badham conjectured *σωτηρίας*. Ast would remove *διὰ* before *κυβερνητικῆς*. Schanz brackets *καὶ* before *παντοδαπῶν*, and the apographa omit it. Ast conjectured *διὰ παντοδαπῶν*. The Armenian does little to remove the difficulties of the passage. It gives the following sense: "Praeterea et civitatum quae per navalia et vires simul salutis, et honores non optimae parti rerum bellicarum retribuerunt. Et enim per artem gubernatoriam, L virorum principatu, et principatu variorum quae (or ? qui) est hominum et non specialiter optimorum, honores singulis non possit quispiam retribuere recte." From which it appears that the Armenian read **ἀρχικῆς* or *ἡγεμονικῆς* instead of *ἐρετικῆς*, and, with the apographa, omitted *καὶ* before *παντοδαπῶν*. It is also almost certain that the Armenian translator read *καὶ* after *σωτηρίας*. He seems to

have understood the whole passage as follows: "Moreover, of cities, those which depend on fleets apportion the forces of safety, as well as the honors, not to the best of the warlike elements," etc.

St. 708 D, Sch. 102. 7 οὐ τὸ σφύζεσθαι τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι μόνον ἀνθρώποις τιμιώτατον ἡγούμενοι. The Arm. renders in the sense τὸ οὕτω σφύζεσθαι καὶ οὐ τὸ εἶναι μόνον κ. τ. λ. It is more probable that this is an ingenious misreading of the text we have, than that the Armenian actually found the above reading in his MS. οὕτω, of course, meant 'by means of political virtue.'

*St. 709 C, Sch. 103. 4. The Version adds the words τε καὶ νομοθετῆσθαι, which in the Paris MS are added in the margin by a second hand, with the remark ἐν ἄλλῳ εὔρον. Ficino translates these words, and all the editions add them. Just below St. 709 C, Sch. 103. 8 the Armenian suggests ἐνδέχεται instead of ἀνέχεται. Ficino also renders 'suscipit.' In the next line the Arm. omits διὰ συνήθειαν.

St. 709 D, Sch. 103. 14 omits μᾶλλον. The words which follow τὸ δὲ συμπενεῦσαι καὶ καθάπερ ἵππων ζεύγος καθ' ἐν εἰς ταυτόν, τὸ λεγόμενον, συμφυσεῖσθαι have given rise to some discussion. For the Paris MS reads καθ' ἕνα. Whether the Armenian translator read καθ' ἕνα or καθ' ἐν cannot be decided; but he removes καὶ after συμπενεῦσαι and sets it after καθ' ἐν. Immediately below the Version retains ὄντως and τελεωτάτων, which are read in the text of the Paris MS.

*St. 708 E, Sch. 103. 21 Ὁγαθέ, ἔοικα περὶ νομοθετῶν ἐπαινῶν καὶ σκοπῶν ἅμα ἐρεῖν τι καὶ φαῦλον. Ficino renders: "Dum et considerare legum latores et laudare vellem, ad vile quid dictu videor lapsus." Perhaps we may infer that he read ἐπαινῶν for ἐπαινῶν. The Version omits καὶ σκοπῶν, but retains ἐπαινῶν. Perhaps καὶ σκοπῶν was added by one who read ἐπαινῶν but was puzzled by the construction περὶ νομοθετῶν ἐπαινῶν.

St. 709 A, Sch. 103. 30. The Version gives instead of ἀνέστρεψε the bad reading ἀνέστρεψε, also given in Stobaeus.

*St. 709 A, Sch. 104. 1. For λοιμῶν the Version has σεισμῶν, after which it retains τε, but omitting καὶ after ἐμπιπτόντων and reading ἀκαιρία. Assuming that ἀκαιρία really stood in his text, the translator read as follows: σεισμῶν τε ἐμπιπτόντων χρόνον ἐπὶ πολὺν ἐνιαυτῶν πολλῶν πολλάκις ἀκαιρία. This is a better reading than the other texts yield, for in them λοιμῶν is superfluous after νόσοι, and τε after λοιμῶν. After σεισμῶν, however, τε is in place, and need not be any more bracketed, as it is by Schanz. The only word which the Arm. removes is καὶ, which may have been inserted by one

who rightly failed to see the connection between human disease (λοιμός) and bad harvests (ἀκαιρία). The latter might ensue as the result of earthquakes.

St. 709 A, Sch. 103. 3. ἀξειεν, the reading of the Paris MS, is given in the Version. Stob.: ἄρξειεν. Just below in 709 B the Arm. agrees with the Paris Codex and Stobaeus in reading ὅμως, against ὁμοίως of the Apogr. Vatic. In the next line Stobaeus has εὖ λέγοντα λέγειν, but the Version agrees with the Paris MS in giving λεγ. εὖ λέγ.

*St. 709 C, Sch. 104. 14. The Version, literally rendered = nam in hiemali tempore comprehendere gubernatoriam maxima efficit, necne et hoc magnum aliquid lucrum ponam artis? We see that it at least retains after κυβερνητικὴν the words ἡ μή, given in the Paris Codex, but rejected by Schanz, in spite of similar uses, like Laws 888 B μέγιστον δέ, ὁ νῦν οὐδέν ἡγεῖ σύ, τὸ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὀρθῶς διανοηθέντα ζῆν καλῶς ἡ μή.

*St. 709 C, Sch. 104. 15, 16. The Version gives the words ἡ πῶς to Klinias and omits οὕτως. Badham felt ἡ πῶς to be awkward at the end of the speech of the Athenians, and conjectured σὺ δὲ πῶς. Stobaeus confirms the Armenian in rejecting οὕτως.

St. 709 C, Sch. 104. 17. The Version implies *καὶ ἐν or καὶν, which Ast conjectured. At the end of the speech it omits δεῖν in l. 22. Just before, in line 20, the Arm. has μέλλει, with Stobaeus, against μέλλοι of the Paris MS.

St. 709 D, Sch. 104. 24–105. 2. Schanz in this difficult passage reads ὀρθῶς τι παρὸν and ἐπιδέον. His app. crit. summarizes the various conjectures of scholars. Adopting his reading, the sense is as follows: "Then will not one who has art in one of the directions mentioned (viz. as pilot or physician or legislator) be rightly able to pray for something given him by fortune and only requiring art in addition?" That is, the artist's prayer will be for those conditions to be given by good fortune under which his art will be able to work and produce what is wanted. The paraphrase of the Armenian translator misses the sense: "Will not, then, one who has art in one of the directions mentioned also pray that he may be able to adjust rightly, by means of his art, that which comes by chance?"

*St. 709 D, 105. 5. For τὴν αὐτῶν εὐχὴν the Armenian has τὴν αὐτὴν εὐχὴν, which gives a better sense. Just below the Paris Codex has δὴ, for which Sch. substitutes ἀν. The Armenian implies δὴ. After that, in l. 10, the Arm. has *φέρε δὴ, ὃ νομοθέτα

κ. τ. λ. Here δ is absent from the Paris Codex, but is conjectured by Schanz, Ficino rendering "O legislator."

*St. 709 E. In the next line the Paris text has δ λαβὼν ἔξεις ὥστ' ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν αὐτὸς τὴν πόλιν ἱκανῶς διοικῆσαι; Here ὥστ' gives offence, for, though examples are to hand of its redundant use with the infinitive after δύναμαι, ἱκανός, etc., none are adducible of such a use after ἔχω. The Armenian involves σύγ', which must be the true reading.

*St. 709 E, Sch. 105. 11-16. The passage which follows is also remedied by the Armenian. Schanz' reading departs from the Paris Codex more widely and gives a less satisfactory sense. He reads: ΑΘ. . . . τί μετὰ τοῦτ' εἰπεῖν ὀρθῶς ἔστιν; ἄρα τοῦ νομοθέτου φράζωμεν τοῦτο; ΚΛ. τί γάρ; ΑΘ. [Ναὶ] τόδε· τυραννουμένην μοι δότε τὴν πόλιν φήσει. Here the Paris Codex has ἦ γάρ, not τί γάρ, and also ναὶ, which "delevit Stallbaum." The Arm. testifies to the following reading of the passage: ΑΘ. . . . τί μετὰ τοῦτ' εἰπεῖν ὀρθῶς ἔστιν τὸ τοῦ νομοθέτου; ἄρα φράζωμεν τοῦτο; ἦ γάρ; ΚΛ. Ναί. ΑΘ. τόδε κ. τ. λ. "*Ath.* What shall we rightly set down after this as *the* answer of the legislator? Shall we indicate this answer? *Klin.* Yes. *Ath.* This he will say," etc. Thus the Armenian only involves the transposition of ἄρα and the addition of τὸ before τοῦ νομοθέτου. To this addition Ficino also testifies, for he renders: "Quid recte deinde dicitur? An legum latoris responsio afferri debet? *Clin.* Utique," etc. Ast conjectured τὸ before τοῦ νομοθέτου.

*St. 710 A, Sch. 105. 19 καὶ νῦν τῇ τυραννουμένῃ ψυχῇ τοῦτο ξυνεπέσθω is the reading of the Paris MS; but it is the πόλις which three lines before was τυραννουμένη, and not the ψυχὴ of the τύραννος. "Affertur alia lectio τῇ τοῦ τυράννου ψυχῇ," notes Stephanus. The Arm. = "et nunc huic quae a tyranno regitur civitati sequatur anima talis." Therefore read ψυχῆς τοῦτο 'the despotically ruled city must have, along with the rest, this element of the soul (in its ruler), if it is to profit by the other qualities (of youth, memory, etc.) which he has already got.' That this is the true sense is clear from the words just below in 710 B: ταύτην τοίνυν ἡμῖν κ. τ. λ. Even if τυραννουμένη be middle, it is still the πόλις, and not the ψυχὴ, of the ruler which may be said to govern itself despotically or to have despotic institutions.

*St. 710 C, Sch. 106. 10. The Armenian includes εὐτυχής in the speech of Klinias, and instead of πρόσθε, μὴ κατ' ἄλλο implies πρόσθε μὴ τι ἄλλο. Therefore the Armenian had the same text as Ficino,

who renders: "*Cli. . . fortis, magnificus atque felix? Athen. Adde nihil aliud, nisi ut,*" etc. Stephanus would give *εὐτυχής* to Clinias.

St. 710 E, Sch. 106. 27. The Arm. implies *λέγομεν δὲ ταῦτα* where the Greek MSS have *δὴ*.

*St. 711 A, Sch. 106. 32 *ταύτη καὶ τότε τάχος καὶ ῥαστώνη κ. τ. λ.* Schanz writes: "in verbis καὶ τότε haereo." The Armenian omits *τότε*. So does Ficino: "ibi celer et facilis fieri mutatio solet."

*St. 711 A, Sch. 107. 2 *οὐχ ἅπαξ ἀλλ' οἶμαι πολλάκις*. The Arm. involves *οὐχ ἅπ. ἀλλὰ καὶ πολ.*

St. 711 B, Sch. 107. 11 *πορεύεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν δεῖ πρῶτον ταύτη*. The Arm. reads *δὴ* for *δεῖ*. The same reading is in one of Bekker's codd. *Ω*.

St. 711 C, Sch. 107. 17. The Arm. agrees with the Paris MS in reading *καὶ πῶς οἴομεθα* without *οὐκ*.

*St. 711 C, Sch. 107. 32 *ἢ τὴν Νέστορος εἰάν ποτέ τις ἐπανέγκη φύσιν*. The verb *ἐπαναφέρω* is used in three other passages in the Laws, viz. I 631 A, III 680 D, V 742 C, and always in the sense of 'to refer or trace a thing back to its source or centre.' In the *Politeia* and *Cratylus*, 434 E and 425 D, it has the same sense; also in *Lysis* 219 C. Thus the sense of 'to bring up again or restore what is past,' which the context requires, is a sense in which *ἐπαναφέρω* is never used in Plato. On the other hand, the sense of 'refer back,' in which he always uses it, is here impossible. The Armenian gives this sense: "vel eam quae Nestoris si quando quis renovaverit naturam." Ficino renders: "aut si quando naturam Nestoris quis reduxerit." It is clear that the Arm. translator read *ἐπανανέωσται* or *ἀνανεώσται*. Cp. *Pol.* II 358 B *ἐπανανέωσομαι τὸν θρασυμάχου λόγον*. Ast in his lexicon renders *ἐπαναφέρω* by *refero*, and gives no reference to this passage in the Laws. The active *ἐπανανέωσις* would involve less change in the text, but it has a post-classical air. The uncials *ΩC* might easily have been confused by a copyist with *ΓK*. Then *ἐπανανέγκηται* would have given way to the more usual form *ἐπανανέγκη*. The change would also be explained if we supposed that the termination *ηται* was written as a compendium in some MS of which the Paris MS is a more or less direct copy, and that this compendium was wrongly copied. Badham suggested such a theory in explanation of most of the bad readings of the Paris MS.

*St. 711 E, Sch. 107. 34. In the next line the Arm. omits *ἀνθρώπων*. As it is not necessary to the sense and is also omitted

in Ficino's version: "quem . . . multo magis omnibus excelluisse ferunt," we can infer that it was not in the Greek texts used by Ficino and by the Armenian translator.

*St. 711 E, Sch. 108. 4. For *ἰόντων λόγων* the Arm. has *ρέόντων λόγων*, which Ficino also read, for he renders: "et illi quoque beati sunt, qui *fluentia* ex ore modesto audiunt verba."

St. 712 B, Sch. 108. 14, 15. The Armenian translator renders: "conemur accommodantes te civitate, seniores tanquam pueri oratione confingere leges." He misunderstood *σοι*.

*St. 712 D, Sch. 109. 2, 3 *καί τις ἐνίοτε μοι φαίνεται πασῶν τῶν πόλεων δημοκρατουμένη μάλιστ' εὐοικεῖναι* is the reading of the Paris MS. Stephanus, following Ficino's version, which has "nonnunquam tamen," conjectured *καί τοι*, which Sch. adopts. The Arm. retains *τις*, but for *δημοκρατουμένη* has *τυραννουμένη* or *τυραννίδι*. The substitution is probably right, since it agrees better with what precedes and renders *τις* more tolerable. The sense may be 'and in a way (or under some aspects *τις*) it sometimes appears to me of all states most to resemble a tyranny.' Just below, in l. 7, the Armenian retains the reading of the Paris Codex: *ἂν ἐρωτηθεῖς*.

*St. 712 E, Sch. 109. 10. Sch. reads *καγὼ φαίνομαι* where the Paris MS has *καταφαίνομαι*. Ficino has "mihi quoque, Megille, perinde ac tibi contigisse videtur." The Arm. translator probably read *καγὼ*, for he renders: "Eadem ista affectione, Megille, videor *ego* affici."

St. 712 E, Sch. 109. 16 *τὸ τοῦ δεσπότου δὲ ἐκάστη προσαγορεύεται κράτος*. The Armenian translator reads *ἐκάστης*, a vicious reading, if it was really in his text.

St. 712 E. The speech *ταῦτόν σοι πάθος* is in the Arm. given to the Athenian. Then the speech *ὅντως γὰρ κ. τ. λ.* to Megillus and *τίς δ' ὁ θεός* to the Athenian. Then *ἄρ' οὖν*, etc., to Megillus. Then the words *οὐκοῦν*—*δρᾶν* to the Athenian, the words *πάνν μὲν οὖν* to Megillus. The Athenian resumes *τῶν γὰρ δὴ* down to *οἰκείται*, and Megillus has the words *σφόδρ' ἂν ὥς*, etc. Comp. the editors.

St. 713 A, Sch. 109. 17, 18. The Armenian involves *χρῆν δ' εἴπερ τοιούτου τινὸς τὴν πόλιν ἔδει ἐπονομάζεσθαι*, **τὸ τοῦ τῶν ἀληθῶς νοῦν ἐχόντων δεσπύζοντος κ. τ. λ.* Just below the Arm. has *γέ τι*, with the Paris Codex, which Sch. corrects to *γ' ἔτι*.

*St. 713 B, Sch. 109. 25 *ἔτι προτέρα τούτων*. The Arm. omits *τούτων*, which is redundant, and not translated by Ficino.

St. 713 C, Sch. 110. 4 *τῆς τῶν τότε μακαρίας ζωῆς*. The Arm. omits *τῶν*. Perhaps Ficino did so also, for he renders: "beatae

illius vitae." Just below, in l. 9, the Arm., along with Ficino and the Paris MS, omits τότε, which Schanz introduces from Julian's citation.

*St. 713 D, Sch. 110. 11 γένους θειοτέρου τε καὶ ἀμείνου. For τε the Armenian has τινος. Ficino and Julian omit τε. Just below, l. 14, the Arm. retains αὐτοῖσι τινας, which Ficino omits.

St. 713, Sch. 110. 15. The Arm. retains ἄρα after θεός, which Sch. omits, following Julian's citation. The Paris Codex has ἄρα καὶ. In the next line, instead of τὸ γένος, the Armenian has *τοῦ γένους, which Ficino also no doubt read: "similiter deus, homines amans, genus daemonum generi nostro praestantius nobis praefecit." Schanz brackets τὸ, for which Hermann conjectured τότε.

*St. 713 E, Sch. 110. 18. The Arm. has εἰρήνην τε καὶ αἰδῶ καὶ ἐλευθερίαν καὶ ἀφθονίαν. Schanz adopts the reading of Julian's citation: εἰρ. τε κ. αἰδῶ καὶ δὴ ἀρθ. The Paris Codex has εἰρ. τε κ. αἰδῶ καὶ εὐνομίαν (γρ. ἐλευθερίαν) καὶ ἀφθονίαν. Ficino agrees with the Armenian: "pacemque et pudicitiam, libertatem et iustitiae copiam proebens."

*St. 713 E, Sch. 110. 22. The Arm. omits οὐδὲ πόρων, which Ficino retains, but, with Ficino, renders ἀνάφνυξις in sense of 'quies.' Both these authorities therefore read ἀνάψυξις, which is also Julian's reading. This is the only one of Julian's divergences from the Paris MS which is reflected in the Armenian. *In the same line the Armenian omits οἷεται, which is not wanted, and perhaps read δεῖ. In the next line, for τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ Κρόνου λεγόμενον βίον the Arm. has *τ. ε. τ. Κρ. γενόμενον β., which Ficino also read: "imitari nos iubet vitam quae sub saturno fuit."

*St. 714 B, Sch. 111. 10 μὴ δὴ φαύλου πέρι. The Arm. has δὲ for δὴ. So also Ficino: "neque de re vili," etc.

*St. 714 C, Sch. 111. 13 ff. οὔτε γὰρ πρὸς κ. τ. λ. The Arm. gives the sense as follows: οὔτε γὰρ . . . τοὺς νόμους, ἀλλ' ὅ τι ἂν καθεστηκυῖα ἢ πολιτεία ξυμφέρον ᾗ, ὅπως ἄρξει τε αἰὲ καὶ μὴ καταλυθῇσεται, τὸν φύσει ὄρον, etc. Perhaps the true reading may be καθεστηκυῖα ἢ πολιτεία ξυμφέρον, ὅπως, etc. The sense of the whole clause would be: "for they say the laws ought to regard not war nor excellence all round, but whatsoever is expedient to the established constitution; namely, that it may always prevail and never be dissolved, thus (they say) is the natural definition of the just best stated." The Armenian has rendered the dative καθεστηκυῖα πολιτεία as if it were nominative and ᾗ as if it were ᾗ. In a MS in which no iota subscript was given, such a blunder was natural enough. The

words *ταύτη δέιν*, which the Paris Codex adds before *τὸ ξυμφέρον*, are omitted in the Armenian. Critics have replaced them by all sorts of conjectures, and all are agreed that they are wrong. Ficino's rendering supports in a marvellous way this explanation: "nec enim ad bellum, nec ad omnem virtutem referri leges debere aiunt: sed ad illud potius, quod constitutae reipublicae conferat, quaecunque illa sit, ut dominetur semper nec pereat; iusti que definitionem sic natura optime se habere contendunt." This would be in Greek: ἀλλ' ὃ τι ἂν καθεστηκνία ἦτις ἂν ἡ πολιτεία ἡ ξυμφέρον, ὅπως κ. τ. λ. Supposing this to be the true text, we may suppose that a copyist who did not see that *καθεστηκνία* and *πολιτεία* were datives, left out *ὃ τι ἂν* and wrote *ἦτις ἂν* instead. Then the introduction of *ταύτη δέιν* (or *ιδεῖν*) would be necessary in order to make sense.

St. 714 C, Sch. 111. 20 λέγ' ἔτι σαφέστερον. Arm. has λέγε τι σαφ.

St. 714 D, Sch. 111. 24. The Arm. adds *ἡ before *δημον*, and just below paraphrases in the following sense: ἡ πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἑαυτῷ (or ἑαυτοῦ) καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ μένειν.

St. 714 E, Sch. 112. 1. The Arm. has *ἀδικημάτων*, which is read in the Paris Codex.

St. 715 A, Sch. 112. 12. The Arm. seems to have omitted *ἥδη*. Also Ficino: "millies namque in civitatibus nonnullis id contigit."

*St. 715 A, Sch. 112. 15 *τά τε πράγματα κατὰ τὴν πόλιν οὕτως ἐσφετέρισαν σφόδρα*. There follows no *καὶ* to answer *τε*, and so Stephanus read *γε* conjecturally. The Arm. involves *τά τε πράγματα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν οὕ. ἐσφ.* and omits *σφόδρα*. Ficino renders: "adeo ad se solos rem contraxerunt."

St. 715 A, Sch. 112. 18. Is it a mere coincidence by which the Arm. and Ficino both render *μήτε αὐτοῖς μήτε ἐκγόνοις* as if it were *μήτε αὐτῶν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις*? Ficino, e. g., has: "ut nullum victis *eorumque* posteris magistratum concesserint."

St. 715 B, Sch. 112. 23. The Arm. retains *στασιώτας . . . πολίτας*, read in the Paris MS, but for *τούτους*, which follows, implies *ὁ* or *οὗς*, which gives no sense. In the next line it adds **οἰόμεθα*, or a word of the same meaning, before *μάτην*. So also Ficino: "et iura sua frustra sic ab eis vocari *censemus*."

St. 715 C, Sch. 112. 30 *νόμων ὑπηρεσίαν*. For *νόμων*, which is a conjecture, the Arm. retains *θεῶν* or *θεοῦ* of the Paris MS; but in the next line the Version implies *δ. εἶναι τὴν μεγίστην τὴν μεγίστην τῷ πρώτῳ*. Ficino renders: "deorum quoque cultum et ministerium dabimus; maximum quidem primo."

*St. 715 D, Sch. 113. 9 ὅσα θεοὶ. The Arm. has ὅσα οἱ θεοί, which Stobaeus also read.

*St. 715 E, Sch. 113. 20. The Arm. has ἄνδρες, which Sch. adopts. Ficino: "O viri." Codex Paris. has ἄνδρες.

*St. 716 A, Sch. 113. 22. The Arm. has εὐθείᾳ περαίνει πάντα κατὰ φύσιν περιφερόμενος. Schelling, Diar. Antiq. 1843, Nr. 88, p. 704, conjectured περιφερόμενος. The Paris MS has περιπορευόμενος and omits πάντα.

*St. 716 A, Sch. 113. 25 ταπεινὸς καὶ κεκοσμημένος. Schanz brackets the last two words, which are 'extra versum' in the Paris MS. Arm. has ταπεινότητι κεκοσμημένος, with which cp. Xenoph. 'Απ. 2, 1, 22 κεκοσμημένην τὸ μὲν σῶμα καθαρότητι, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα αἰδοῖ. In the same line the Arm. implies ὅστις δέ, or less probably εἰ δέ τις, where the Paris MS has ὁ δέ τις. Just below the Arm. implies ἀνοίᾳ φλέγεται, with the Paris MS.

St. 716 B, Sch. 114. 2. For πάντα ἅμα the Arm. has, with Theodoret, citing this passage, ἅμα πάντα.

St. 716 B, Sch. 114. 7. The Arm. has as follows: Δῆλον δὴ τοῦτό γε, ὥς τῶν ξυνακολουθησόντων τῷ θεῷ, εἰς τὸ μέλλον δεῖ διανοηθῆναι πάντα ἄνδρα. "This much, then, is clear, that we must for the future conceive of every man among those who shall follow along with God." But this is not satisfactory, and ὅτι, which Schanz conjectures before ὥς, is still required. Of course, εἰς τὸ μέλλον may easily have been corrupted into ἐσόμενον, but it seems otiose. The phrase used in the Version, and which I render by εἰς τὸ μέλλον, admits of being put into Greek quite literally by the phrase εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον. In the long speech of the Athenian which follows, the Armenian reflects the Paris MS in the following readings, which Schanz or others find unsatisfactory, viz. St. 716 D, Sch. 114. 18 καὶ ἄδικος. Just below, l. 22, δεῖ where Sch. writes ἀεὶ. In St. 717 A, Sch. 114. 30 the Arm. has ἐγκαίροτατος. Then Sch. 115, l. 1 ἔφεςσις and λεγόμενα, l. 4 ἀρίστεια or ἀριστεῖα. Then in St. 718 A, Sch. 116, l. 4 Arm. has δαπάνης τε, in l. 6 of same page it has ἄν, which Stobaeus omits. Just below, in l. 10, πρὸς θεῶν. In l. 12, lastly, it has the same lacuna after διέξοδος as the Paris MS. In the following passages, however, in this speech it varies from the Paris Codex:

St. 716 D, Sch. 114. 22. The Arm. has εὐχαῖς καὶ ξύμπασις ἀναθήμασι καὶ θεραπείᾳ θείᾳ ὁ καὶ κάλλιστον. Here θείᾳ may be right.

St. 716 E, Sch. 114. 27 omits δῶρα after μισθοῦ. Just below, in l. 29, it renders τοῖς ἀνοσίοις in the sense of τοῖς ἀδίκους, and in the

next line *όσοις* in the sense of *καθαροίς*. *In the same line it has for *άπασιν* the nom. sing. *άπας*, which is certainly right, the sense being that, for the unholy, all their arduous and ample labor is in vain, but for the pure in heart *every* service (*άπας*), however humble, is in season, even if it be not *ό πολύς*. Ficino: "quod opportune faciunt omnes sancti"; so he read *άπασιν*.

*St. 717 A, Sch. 114. 31 *βέλη δὲ αὖ*. Here the Paris MS has *β. δὲ αὐτοῦ*, which is impossible. The Arm. has *αὐτὰ* or *ταῦτα*. The Basle edition already had *αὐτὰ*. Ficino: "sagittae vero ad illud quatenam?"

St. 717 B, Sch. 115. 6, 7 *τοῖς δὲ τούτων ἄνωθεν* down to *νυνδῆ*]. The Arm. omits, but since these words are glanced at in Plutarch, de Iside, p. 361 A, they can hardly be a gloss. Ficino renders them.

*St. 717 B, Sch. 115. 13 *νομίζειν δέ*. The Arm. adds *δεῖ*. This must have stood in the original Greek, for Ficino also adds it: "putare enim quisque debet omnia quae possidet eorum esse."

*St. 717 C, Sch. 115. 17. The Armenian reads *καὶ* after instead of before *ὑπερπονούντων*, and in l. 19 *δὴ παλαιοῖς* for *δὲ παλαιοῖς*. These very insignificant changes make the Greek text to run more smoothly. Ficino's text also must have transposed the *καὶ*: "haec omnia videlicet mutuo data persolvens, et pro curis doloribusque priscis parentum, in senecta recentes reddens, quando maxime indigent."

St. 717 E, Sch. 115. 29 *τῶν εἰθισμένων ὄγκον* is Schanz' reading. The Paris MS has *ὄγκων*, but *τῶν εἰθισμένων*. Stobaeus has *τὸν εἰθισμένον ὄγκον*. The Arm. has *τὸν εἰθισμένον νόμον*. Ficino: "consuetam magnitudinem." Here *νόμον* might be right, but *ὄγκον* is more graphic.

*St. 717 E, Sch. 115. 30. The Paris Codex and Stobaeus share the vicious reading *τοὺς αὐτῶν γενήτας*. Schanz conjectures and reads *τοῖς αὐτῶν γεννηταῖς*, which is actually involved by the Armenian and was also read by Ficino: "quae maiores genitoribus suis struebant."

St. 717 E, Sch. 116. 1. For *ἐπιμελείας* the Armenian Version has *μνήμας*, which is inept. Just below it omits *παρεχόμενον*, and translates the entire clause as if it were *τῷ (or τὸ) δὲ μὴ παραλείπειν μνήμην ἐνδελεχῇ αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ τούτῳ μάλιστα' αἰὲν πρεσβεύειν, δαπάνης τε κ. τ. λ.*

St. 718 B, Sch. 116. 13. For *βίᾳ καὶ* the Arm. has *βιαία*. In reading an old text a translator might confuse *καὶ* with *ιαί*.

*St. 718 B, Sch. 116. 18. The Arm. has *παράδειγμα προενεγκόντα*, which Ficino also read: "horum exemplum." The Paris MS has *δείγμα*.

St. 718 D, Sch. 116. 30. After *λεχθέντα* the Arm. introduces this gloss: *περὶ θυσιῶν καὶ γονέων*. In the next line it omits *εἰς τὸ*, but in the rest of this hard speech it faithfully reflects the readings of the Paris Codex.

St. 719 A, Sch. 117. 13. The Armenian read *φέρειν*, with the Paris Codex. Cp. Hesiod, op. 213, for a similar use. Why does Schanz in his text adopt the insipid reading *πέλει* of the editions of Hesiod? Plato certainly read *φέρειν*.

*St. 719 A, Sch. 117. 16 *εἰ τὸ μέσον αὐτὸ θείναι* is read in the Paris MS. Badham conjectured *αὐ* for *αὐτὸ*, which Schanz adopts. The Arm. omits *αὐτὸ*. In the preceding line, for *ὃ γέ μοι* it implies *ὥς γέ μοι*. Ficino: "verum quo sermonis spectabat progressio, volo in medio vobis proponere." The Armenian also assigns *πάνν μεν οὖν* to Clinias.

St. 719 B, Sch. 117. 20. The Arm. omits *οὐ* before *δῆλον*, and after it reads *ὃ τι*.

St. 719 D, Sch. 118. 8. The Arm. omits *δεῖ* after *ἀεὶ*.

*St. 719 D, Sch. 118. 13. The Arm. has *θάπτειν αὐτήν* 'and if it were commanded to bury her in poetry.' This is better than *αὐτήν*, read in the Paris MS and implied by Ficino's rendering.

*St. 720 A, Sch. 118. 30. After *πρώτατον* the Arm. omits *αὐτόν*, which "delevit Badham." Just before, after *ἀναμνησκόμεθα*, in l. 28, the Armenian omits *δὲ*.

*St. 720 C, Sch. 119. 16. The Paris MS has *ἐκάστου περί νοσήματος ἐκάστου τῶν οἰκετῶν*. Schanz notes thus: "unum alterumne ἐκάστου delendum esse videtur." The Arm. has *ἐκάστω περί νοσήματος ἐκάστων τ. οἰκ.*, which may be right.

*St. 720 E, Sch. 120. 2, 3. The Paris MS, which Schanz follows, has *τίν' ἄρα πρῶτων νόμον θεῖτ' ἂν ὁ νομοθέτης; ἄρ' οὐ κατὰ φύσιν τὴν περὶ γενέσεως ἀρχὴν πρῶτην πόλεων περί κατακοσμήσει ταῖς τάξεσιν; Badham felt this text to be wrong, and conjectured *τὸν περὶ γένεσιν, ὡς ἀρχὴν πρῶτην πόλεων, πρὶν κατακοσμήσαι ταῖς τάξεσι*. For *περί* Stephanus conjectured *παρὰ*. The Arm. involves *ἄρ' οὐ τὸν κατὰ φύσιν, τὴν περὶ γεν. ἀρ. πόλ. περί πρῶτην κατακ. ταῖς πράξεσιν;* which, however, is not quite satisfactory. Ficino adheres to the text of the Paris MS.*

*St. 721 A, Sch. 120. 7 *καὶ ἡ κοινωνία* is read in the Arm., as also in Codex A Stobaei. Just below the Arm. involves *γαμικοὶ δὲ δὴ*

νόμοι. The Paris Codex has *δη* and omits *δε*. The codices of Stobaeus have some *δη* and some *δε*, some neither.

*St. 721 A, Sch. 120. 12 *ἔχοι δ' ἂν πῶς; ἴσως ᾧδε*. The Arm. has *ἔχοι δ' ἂν ἴσως ᾧδε*. Badham conjectured *πῶς ἴσως*. Ficino: "quae sic se forsan habebit." In next line, for *γαμῖν δέ* the Arm. perhaps implies *γαμῖν γε* or *γ. δὴ*, but hardly *γ. δέ*.

*St. 721 B, Sch. 120. 15, 16. The Arm. has *χρήμασι μὲν τόσοις καὶ τοῖς, τῇδε δὲ καὶ τῇ ἀτιμίᾳ*. Heindorf conjectured *τῇδε δὲ καὶ τῇ ἀτ.*, of which reading there are traces in the Paris MS and in the MSS of Stobaeus. Ficino: "dedecore autem tali quodam vel tali."

St. 721 B, Sch. 120. 19 *διανοηθέντα ὡς ἔστιν ᾧ κ. τ. λ.* The Arm. = cogitantem quia sit veritabiliter humanum genus et natura quadam particeps est immortalitatis, which is a bungle.

*St. 721 D, Sch. 120. 31 *τόσφ καὶ τόσφ*. Arm. = *τόσφ καὶ τῷ*.

St. 721 D, Sch. 121. 5 *πότερον αὐτοὺς διπλοῦς*]. The Arm. adds *αὐτῶν*. *αὐτῶν* would not be amiss. Just below it retains *τῷ μήκει τὸ σμικρότατον*.

*St. 722 A, Sch. 121. 14. The Arm. has *αἰροίμην*, with the Apographum Marcianum. The Paris Codex has *ἐροίμην*. Lower down in the same speech, l. 29, the Arm. reads *μάχην*, with the Paris MS.

*St. 722 C, Sch. 121. 33 *ἐξ αὐτῶν ὧν νῦν διειλέγεσθαι*. The Arm. = ex iis etiam nunc a nobis selectis, which corresponds to *ἐξ αὐτῶν ὧν νυνδὴ εἰλόμεσθαι* (or *ἡρήμεσθαι*). Schanz notes: "νυνδὴ scribendum videtur." Just below, Sch. 122. 1, for *τινα γεγονός* the Arm. has **τι γεγονός*, which must be right. Ficino read *τινα* and *διειλέγεσθαι*: "quod per ea, de quibus disseruimus, nobis Deo quodam adspirante factum est."

St. 723 D, Sch. 123. 11 *οὐδὲ περὶ ᾄσματος*. The Arm. has *οὐδὲ γὰρ ᾄσματος*, with the Paris Codex. Ficino seems to have had *οὐδὲ γὰρ περὶ ᾄσμ.*, for he renders: "non enim in cantu neque in omni sermone."

*St. 723 E, Sch. 123. 25 *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο*. The Arm. involves *μ. δὲ τοῦτο δὴ*. The second hand adds *ἥδη* in margin of the Paris Codex.

*St. 724 A, Sch. 123. 34. The Arm. omits *αὐτῶν* before *ψυχὰς*. So also Ficino: "Post illa vero quae ad animos, quae ad corpora," etc. Just below, in l. 35, for *προσῆκόν τ'* the Arm. has *προσῆκον δ'*.

The above exhausts, for the IVth book of the Laws, the readings in respect of which the Greek text of the Armenian translator differed from that of the celebrated Paris Codex. Hitherto we

have had but two witnesses to the text of the Laws, to wit, (1) the Paris Codex, of which all our other MSS are copies, more or less remote, and (2) the Latin Version of Ficino, representing an independent Greek text which must have perished towards the beginning of the XVIth century; and we may rank the ancient authors, chiefly Eusebius and Stobaeus, who have handed us down citations of the Laws, as a third source of testimony. But the variants either implied by Ficino or given in the Florilegists were always liable to doubt, so long as they stood alone. There was no certainty, for example, that an omission or addition or other change in Ficino's Version was more than a device of translation. In Eusebius or Stobaeus similarly they might be due to careless citation. It may be claimed for a version like the Armenian that in scores of passages it removes this uncertainty, which especially attaches to omissions and additions. For wherever it supports a various reading found either in Ficino or the excerptors, we are at once certain that that variant was actually in the Greek text used. In this IVth book there are many passages in which Ficino and the excerptors win such support. In every such case a variant, if it really mends the text, is doubly confirmed; while, in case it does not mend the text, the mere participation in error proves that we have in the Armenian a text which has *pro tanto* had the same history and comes from the same hands as that whose errors it shares. When our collation of the whole of the Armenian Version is concluded, we shall try to exhibit in a summary the new evidence which the Armenian and Latin Versions, in conjunction with one another, afford in respect of the families of the texts of the Laws used by the various excerptors of antiquity, by Stobaeus in particular.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.